

APPENDIX G

Description of Corrections

Project Team members from General Motors, Ford and Chrysler reviewed a draft of the data in this report and compared the data with their records to check for accuracy. This review was a substantial help in identifying errors and revealing areas where there might be confusion about the data. This appendix describes the results of that review.

A number of differences were identified between the TRI data in the report and the data in the companies' records. Investigation of these differences revealed two primary reasons (other than errors in transcription) for the discrepancies. First, in a few cases there had been revisions submitted by the companies since the data were pulled from the national TRI database. Because the TRI database is continually updated, data pulled at different times may be inconsistent. Where this was the case, the data in this report were updated to the most current values. Second, some apparent discrepancies were due to use of different sections of the TRI database. Companies in some cases used Section 8 data to compare with the report data, which are based on Sections 5 and 6 of the TRI Form R. The report retains the Section 5 and 6 data, for consistency. However, this comparison illustrated the substantial confusion that can arise due to the presence of similar data categories in two parts of the TRI data that are defined differently. Confusion could be reduced if TRI reports and databases accessible to the public were clearly annotated to show which section of the Form R specific data are drawn from.

Chrysler made changes to the VOC and NO_x emissions data that had been obtained from state contacts. These changes were incorporated in the report. Discussion of the discrepancies with state contacts revealed that emissions data can differ for a variety of reasons, including delays in updating state data, different decisions about what parts of a complex facility should be included as the assembly plant, and state revisions to the data (such as Delaware's practice of increasing emissions estimates by a standard 15 percent to reflect "rule effectiveness").

The companies suggested a number of changes to the latitude and longitude coordinates, generally to be consistent with the coordinates they originally submitted with their TRI Form Rs. This report retains the "preferred" or "corrected" coordinates developed as described in Appendix F. Review of the suggested corrections showed that in most cases the two alternatives were very close (e.g., at different points within the plant boundary). The review also illustrated the ambiguity involved in picking a single location point for large sites such as assembly plants. As noted in Appendix F, users of the data compiled for areas around plants should be aware that use of different but equally valid coordinates might show different results (e.g., for population density or number of area TRI reporters.)